



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,462	12/09/2003	Lilia P. Burleva	87416JLT	5805
7590	10/07/2005			
Paul A. Leipold Patent Legal Staff Eastman Kodak Company 343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201			EXAMINER CHEA, THORL	
			ART UNIT 1752	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NE ✓

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/731,462

Applicant(s)

BURLEVA ET AL.

Examiner

Thori Chea

Art Unit

1752

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: None.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Thori Chea
Thori Chea
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1752

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reason set forth in the Final Office Action. The claimed invention is related to the claiming of a process for forming a photothermographic emulsion. The process for forming a silver halide grains by ex-situ and in-situ have been conventionally practiced in the art. Winslow et al discloses a decomposition of sulfur compound in oxidizing environment to chemically sensitize the silver halide grains. It would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use compound taught in Riester et al in the process of Winslow et al with a reasonable expectation of increasing the sensitivity of silver halide grains in either in situ, ex situ or the combination thereof in oxidizing environment. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 on April 28, 2005 and the substance presented in the argument is related to the results associated with the article containing a gold compound and the diphenylphosphinesulfide disclosed in the copending application 10/731,251. However, the invention presently claimed is directed to a process claimed contains no gold compound therein. The Declaration fails to show the criticality of the combination of the processing steps presently claimed. It is improper to conclude that the improvement found in the material is a directed link to the process of forming thereof. Riester et al is not a non-analogous art, but a related art. Both sulfur compound have been known as chemical sensitizer for a silver halide grains for both photographic and photothermographic material. Both photographic and photothermographic material require imagewise exposure to form a latent image before either wet processing or dry developing. It would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art to chemically sensitize the silver halide grains to increase the speed thereof using a known chemical sensitizer such as metal compound or sulfur compound. Accordingly, it is still believed that the invention as claimed would have been found prima facie obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.